

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Almost MMISSO TEKET PATENTIONAL THATESIAVILY WAS DEPARTED BY A STATE OF THE WAS DEPARTED BY A STATE OF THE WAS DEPARTED BY A STATE OF THE WAS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	HRSI NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 769,510	01/26/2001	Tomohiro Nakajima	202462U82	6109
22880	2590 02 30 2003			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE S ALEXANDRI			PAIK, STEVE S	
			ART UNII	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/769,510	NAKAJIMA ET AL.	NAKAJIMA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Steven S. Paik	2876		
	G DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	;	
Period for Reply		ED. V.IO OET TO EVDIDE . M	ONTHIO) EDOM		
THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS from the period for reply specified to reply sees. Failure to reply within the Arry reply received by the earned patent term adjust.	E OF THIS COMMUNICATION TO BE available under the provisions of 37 C om the mailing date of this communication above is less than thirty (30) days, specified above, the maximum statutory part of the set or extended period for reply will, by	FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely HS from the mailing date of this communic ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation	
Status 1) Responsive	to communication(s) filed on	11/01/00			
1) Responsive 2a) This action i	to communication(s) filed on	This action is non-final.			
, <u> </u>	,	llowance except for formal matt	fore prospecution as to the mo-	rite ie	
	cordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D		113 13	
4)⊡ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u>	7 is/are pending in the applic	ation.			
4a) Of the abo	ove claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.				
6)☐ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.			
Application Papers					
•	ion is objected to by the Exa				
	·	accepted or b) \square objected to by th			
* *	• •	to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	` ',		
		is: a) approved b) di	sapproved by the Examiner.		
_	corrected drawings are required eclaration is objected to by th	. •			
	•	е схапшет.			
Priority under 35 U.S.		roing priority under 25 H.C.C. C	440(=) (=) == (5)		
_		reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	Some * c) None of:	manta hawa hasa sasaiwad			
	d copies of the priority docur		unlingtion No		
_		ments have been received in Ap		_	
арр	olication from the Internationa	priority documents have been in al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). a list of the certified copies not r	_	;	
		nestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §		ication).	
-	lation of the foreign land and	· · ·		,	
	Properties (2015), s Patent Drawing Review PTO-948 Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	5) ☐ Notice of in	urm ar, ie 7 - 41 si Paper Nelisi iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application Control Number: 09 769,510

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Response to the applicant's response to an Election of Species Requirement

1. The examiner has fully considered the applicant's response (paper No. 7) to an Election of Species Requirement. The examiner has identified an inadvertent error with selecting appropriate figures in Group II of the claimed invention. Accordingly, a new Office Action of Election/Restrictions is generated in response to the applicant's request of a written Election/Restrictions requirement.

Election/Restrictions

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Group I: Figures 1, 3 and 4, drawn to an optical scan module which includes a drive circuit for the light emission source or a drive circuit for the deflection unit integrally fixed to a holder.

Group II: Figures 22, 23, 25 and 26, drawn to an image reader/generator system for reading a readable text which includes an optical writing unit further including a light emission source and a deflection unit.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that

Application/Control Number: 09/769,510

Art Unit: 2876

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 3. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).
- 5. A telephone call was made to Mr. Raymond F. Cardillo Jr. on February 6, 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. The applicant has requested a written Election/Restriction requirement since the inventors are in a foreign country.

Application/Control Number: 09/769,510

Art Unit: 2876

Page 4

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an

election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR

1.143).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Steven S. Paik whose telephone number is 703-308-6190. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (5:30am-2:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-6893 for regular

communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0530.

Oleven Paik

Steven S. Paik

Examiner

Art Unit 2876

ssp

February 6, 2003

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800